# An Account of a Recent Publication on the Golden Purple Codex of the Pierpont Morgan Collection

BY

H. HYVERNAT

1858 - 1941

[Reprinted from *The Catholic University Bulletin*, Vol. XVII, No. 6, 1911.]

BALTIMORE
J. H. FURST COMPANY
1911

# AN ACCOUNT[1] OF A RECENT PUBLICATION ON THE GOLDEN PURPLE CODEX OF THE PIERPONT MORGAN COLLECTION.

---

The Golden-Latin-Gospels ℙ In The Library of J. Pierpont Morgan (Formerly Known As The "Hamilton Gospels" And Some times as King Henry The VIIIth's Gospels), Now Edited For The First Time With Critical Introduction And Notes And Accompanied by Four Full-Page Fac-Similes, By H. C. Hoskier, New York, Privately Printed, MCMX, Fol., pp. cxvi, 365.

## I.

### The Place of the J. Pierpont Morgan Manuscript Among the Purple Codices.

It may not be amiss to preface the description of this sumptuously gotten up volume with some general information on the magnificent Morgan Codex and the class of manuscripts to which it belongs.

The art of Chrysography is very ancient. As early as the beginning of the second century B. C. we read in the Pseudo-Aristeas that the copy of the Sacred Scriptures which the high priest Eleazar sent to the King of Egypt was written in gold letters.[2] But it is not until the middle of the third

[1] An *account*, not a *criticism*, our object being simply to call the attention of the public to Mr. Hoskier's work, and, especially to the P. Morgan Codex itself. We leave it for specialists in Latin Versions of the New Testament to criticise the author's methods and conclusions. *Ne sutor supra crepidam.*

[2] For the date of Aristeas' letter see Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1900, p. 16, for the passage itself, p. 549, cf. Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* XII, 10, Georg. Syncellus, *Chronographia*, edit. Dindorff, I, p. 517.

century of the Christian era that we find a mention of purple-dyed parchment or vellum being used further to enhance the beauty of chrysographic codices. Maximin the Younger had been presented by one of his aunts with a copy of the complete works of Homer written entirely in gold on purple vellum:[3] From the time of Constantine this expensive style of Calligraphy was reserved, it seems, to the Sacred Scriptures and in particular, if we judge from the specimens that have come down to us, to such books of them as were of liturgical use, as the Psalter and above all the Four Gospels. This custom originated very likely with a desire of impressing the due reverence for the word of God upon the still spiritually untrained minds of the thousands who at that time were coming over to the Church from all ranks of society, within the Roman Empire and outside as well. St. Bonifacius, the Apostle of Germany, writing to the Abbess Eadburga (725) says: "I beg you also to write for me, in gold, the epistles of my Lord Peter the Apostle for the honor and reverence of the Sacred Scriptures before the eyes of my carnal auditors."[4] The faithful also not unfrequently had such costly copies of the Gospels executed for their own private use, though not always for as commendable reasons. And this gave St. John Chrysostom the occasion of remarking in one of his homilies that fewer were those who cared to show that they knew the contents of the Gospels than those who boasted having them written in gold.[5] The manuscripts were generally exceedingly large and heavy, and not always as remarkable for their correctness as for their price. "Let those who want them," says St. Jerome, "have ancient books, or books written in gold or silver on purple parchment, or in so-called uncial letters, written burdens rather than codices, *Onera magis exarata quam codices.*[6]

[3] Historia Augusta, Jul. Capitolinus, *De Maxim. Jun.* IV, 4.

[4] Epist. XIX (Serrarius, XXVIII), Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 89, col. 712.

[5] Hom. 32 in Joann. Migne, *P. G.* 59, col. 187.

[6] *Praefat. in Job*, Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 22, col. 418. Cf. *Epist. ad Eustochium, de custod. Virginit., ibid.*, vol. 28, col. 1083.

None of these very early manuscripts written entirely in gold letters on purple are now extant. But we have several ones in silver letters, with, in some cases, portions in gold writing. The chief ones among the Greek manuscripts are first, the *Codex Beratinus* at Berat, Albania (Φ); it is entirely in silver letters and dates probably from the fifth century.[7] Second, the *Codex Rossanensis* (Σ) in the Archbishop's library at Rossano, Southern Italy. It is written in silver letters, the first three lines of each Gospel being in gold, and dates probably from the sixth century if not a little earlier.[8] Third, *Codex Purpureus* (N) the only known Greek purple manuscript until the discovery of (Σ) hence its name. Its probable date is the sixth century. The writing is in silver letters with the exception of the titles in the upper margins and the sacred names, God, Jesus, etc., which are in gold.[9]

The earliest purple Latin manuscripts are about of the same age and style as the Greek ones. The three best known are the *Codex Veronensis* (*b*) in silver letters of the fifth

[7] It was described at length and illustrated with a plain photographic fac-simile by Abbé P. Batiffol who visited Berat in 1882, for that express purpose. His description is found in its ultimate form in *Archives des Missions Scientifiques*, Série III, vol. XIII, pp. 437 ff.

[8] Gebhardt and Harnack who discovered it in 1879, published an account of it the following year, *Codex Rossanensis*, Lipsiae, 1880. "In a sumptuous form, far more satisfactory to the artist than to the Biblical critic" (Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the N. T. Criticism*, 4th edit., 1894, I, p. 164). It is the earliest known copy of the Scripture with miniatures in water colors.

[9] Forty-five folios only of this manuscript are known so far to be extant. Of these thirty-three are in the Library of the Convent of Patmos.—For an account and the text of these see L. Duchesne, *Mission au Mont Athos* in *Archives des Missions Scientifiques*, Série III, vol. III, Paris, 1876, pp. 386-419,—four at the British Museum (Cotton. Titus C. XV), two at Vienna (Lambec, 2) and six at the Vatican (Vatic. 3785). These last six were published with an excellent fac-simile in colors by Cozza-Luzzi, *Pergamene purpuree Vaticane di Evangeliario a caratteri di oro e di argento*, Roma, 1887. It is very likely that the manuscript once was extant in its entirety at Patmos.

century.[10] The *Codex Palatinus* (*e*) in gold and silver of the same date,[11] and the *Codex Saretianus* (*j*) in silver writing also of the same age,[12] the *Codex Brixianus* (*f*),[13] and the Psalter of St. Germain, bishop of Paris († 576),[14] both in silver and gold letters, and of the sixth century. To the sixth century also belongs the Upsala *Codex Argenteus* of the Gothic Version.[15]

For some reason or other manuscripts on purple vellum seem to have been much less common during the following two centuries. None at any rate are now extant that we could safely ascribe to the seventh century or to the first six or seven decades of the eighth, with the possible exception of a copy of the Vulgate of the Gospels in the golden capital letters which L. Delisle thinks might date from the eighth century. It contains now only St. Matthew and part of St. Mark.[16]

[10] Published by Blanchinus (Bianchini) in *Evangelium Quadruplex*, etc. Rome, 1749. Cf. Gregory, *Prolegomena*, p. 954. The MS. is preserved in the Library of the Chapter of Verona (Italy).

[11] Vienna (Imper. Libr. Lat. 1185) and Dublin (Trinity College, N. 4, 18); cf. Gregory, *op. cit.*, p. 955.

[12] Published by Amelli, *Dissertazione Critico-Storica*, 2d edit. Milan, 1885, "with a fac-simile whose characters much resemble the round and flowing shape of those in *a b f*." Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, etc., II, p. 48 Cf. Gregory, *Prolegomena*, p. 964, and *Cozza-Luzzi, op. cit.*, p. 5 f.

[13] Published by Blanchinus, *op. cit.* Cf. Gregory, *op. cit.*, p. 957*. It is preserved in the Library of the Chapter of Brescia (Italy).

[14] Paris, Bibl. Nation. Lat. 11947. Described in Sylvestre, *Universal Palaeography* I, p. 296 ff. *Album*, pl. CX (in colors).

[15] An excellent fac-simile in colors of this beautiful manuscript (University Library, Upsala) will be found in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. IX, p. 616, and a brief notice, chiefly historical, in Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, etc., 4th edit., II, p. 146.

[16] Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 11955. For particulars on this manuscript and information as to the literature concerning it, see Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Age*, Paris, 1893. This is probably the *Codex Evangelii S. Matthaei* mentioned by Blanchinus, *Evangelium Quadruplex*, II, fol. dxcvii recto, col. 2, on the authority of Montfaucon, *Bibl. Biblioth.* II, p. 1041 and ascribed there to the seventh century. A few more Greek and Latin manuscripts of the Scriptures supposedly of the seventh century, are given by Blanchinus in his list of *Codices aurei, argentei et purpurei* (*op. cit.*, II fol. dxciii ff.), but we

Toward the end of the eighth century and during the early decades of the ninth century we meet again with quite a number of beautiful purple codices of the Vulgate. The appearance coincides with the revival of Chrysography, under Charlemagne. Several of them are probably due more or less directly to the Scriptorium that he had established in his own palace under the direction of Alcuin, the so-called Palatine School.[17] Such are for instance the *Evangéliaire de Godescalc* of 781-783, entirely in gold on purple,[18] as are also the *Gospels of Abbeville* which belong to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century.[19] The *Evangiles du Sacre,* found as the tradition goes, on the knees of Charlemagne when Otho III opened his tomb, are also in gold on purple, with the exception of the titles, in silver.[20] Let us mention also the *Bible de Théodulfe* one of the finest codices in existence. Some portions are in gold, others, in particular the Psalms and the Gospels, in silver letters on purple.[21] Nevertheless the art of staining purple vellum was on the decline and soon after Charlemagne's death (814) it gradually went out of practice.

From the above remarks it really seems as if the seventh and eighth centuries marked the ebb in the production of manuscripts during the early medieval times. An exception, however, must be made in favor of Rome, where the pious industry of multiplying the Sacred Books for the local churches and the missions was, even then, flourishing as attested by history. St. Augustine and his companions whom St. Gregory the Great sent to preach the Gospel in England (597) were

have failed to identify them with now known manuscripts. Among them is a Greek copy of the Gospels all in gold on purple vellum which Montfaucon saw at St. John *de Carbonara* (Naples) and pronounces a manuscript of quite exceptional beauty, *nihil porro concinnius vidimus* (Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca,* p. 4).

[17] Berger, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[18] Paris, B. N. Nouv. acq. Lat. 1933. See Berger, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[19] Abbeville, Library of the city, No. 1; see Berger, *op. cit.* pp. 267, 374.

[20] Vienna, Imperial Treasury; see Berger, *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 421.

[21] Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 9380. For a full account of this Bible see Berger, *op. cit.* p. 149 ff., 405.

certainly well stocked with books from the Roman copying-rooms when they left the Eternal City. We know also from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bede that St. Benedict Biscop, abbot of the two Northumbrian monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, made five pilgrimages to Rome, and in at least three of them, collected a large number of books for the use of the Anglo-Saxon churches.[22] Soon, however, scriptoria were established in the various monasteries of Northumbria which, in course of time rivalled—and if we judge from the specimens that have come down to us—outstripped those of the Mother-Church. It is enough to mention the famous *Codex Amiatinus*[23] which Ceolfrid († 716) companion and successor of St. Benedict sent as a present to the Holy See; the Lindisfarne Gospels (Br. Mus. Nero, D. 4) copied by Eadfrid († 721) in the "holy island" of Lindisfarne "in honor of St. Cuthbert" († 687) about 700, the Stonyhurst Gospel of St. John found in St. Cuthbert's coffin in 1104.

It would be surprising that monks who could execute manuscripts of such exquisite taste as those should have never thought of trying their hands at chrysographic codices on purple vellum. That they did so in at least one instance is a fact that cannot be called in question. In St. Wilfrid's life written soon after his death by Eddius Stephanus, we read that the saintly Archbishop of York who was also abbot of Ripon had presented the Church of this monastery with just

[22] Cf. the letter of St. Martin I (640-655) to Amandus, bishop of Trajectum (Maestricht): Reliquias vero Sanctorum de quibus praesentium lator nos admonuit dari praecepimus. Nam codices jam exinaniti sunt a nostra bibliotheca et unde ei dare nullatenus habuimus; transcribere autem non potuit quoniam festinanter de hac civitate regredi properavit (Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 87, col. 138).

[23] Thus called from the Abbey of Monte Amiato, near Siena where it was preserved for many years. It is now in the Laurentian Library of Florence. On this beautiful MS. see De Rossi, *La Bibbia offerta de Ceolfrido Abbate al Sepolcro di S. Pietro*, etc. Rome, 1887, (with fac-simile of folio bearing the dedicatory inscription, also Vigouroux, *Dictionn. de la Bibl.* I, 480 ff. (Art. *Amiatinus*, by P. Batiffol, with a good fac-simile of the upper half of a page).

such a copy of the Gospels on the day of its consecration: "... *addens quoque Sanctus Pontifex noster inter alia bona dona ad decorem domus Dei inauditum ante saeculis nostris quoddam miraculum. Nam quattuor Evangelia de auro purissimo in membranis depurpuratis*[24] *coloratis pro animae suae rimedio scribere jussit, necnon et bibliothecam librorum eorum omnem de auro purissimo et gemmis pretiosissimis fabrefactam compaginare inclusores gemmarum jussit.*" (Gale, *Historiae Britannicae,* etc. *Scriptores XV,* Oxford, 1694, p. 60, cf. Hoskier, p. xii f.)

This interesting passage of St. Wilfrid's life leads us naturally to speak now of the Morgan manuscript, for no less an authority in paleography than Wattenbach suggested that it might be the very manuscript mentioned by Eddius Stephanus.[25]

The verso of the first folio which is of purple color like the others and serves as guard-leaf, shows the coat of arms of the Kings of England, with the following inscription in a beautiful hand of the sixteenth century and in gold letters:

FATO SERVATUS TIBI SUM, TER MAXIME PRINCEPS
TE QUOQUE SERVARUNT AUREA FATA MICHI
INSTAURATA NITENT PER TE SACRA DOGMATA PER TE
AUREUS EST AUTHOR CHRISTUS UBIQUE MEUS

and, on an inserted leaf, a note states that this manuscript was sent to Henry VIII, as a present by Leo X.[26] How old this note is, we are not told by any of the few who have written about our manuscript. At any rate Wattenbach[27] is of the

[24] Sic! read *de purpura(?) as in Blanchinus, op. cit.*, fol. dxcii recto a, who quotes from Mabillon's *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedicti,* Saec. IV, part II, p. 552. Yet Hoskier, who seems to quote from Mabillon, has also *depurpuratis.*

[25] See below in our description of Mr. Hoskier's *Introduction.*

[26] Wattenbach, *Sitzungsberichte d. Kön. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. zu Berlin,* 1889, p. 152.

[27] *Ibid.*

opinion that the latinity of the inscription, the last verse in particular, is not quite good enough for the Chancery of Leo X. He would rather attribute it to Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop of York, in whose diocese the monastery of Ripon was. Mr. Hoskier hesitates to accept this view because the supporters of the coat of arms do not tally with those of Henry VIII. For the same reason he rejects also the suggestion by the author of the Hamilton sale Catalogue—who sees in the words *instaurata . . . dogmata* an allusion to the Reformation—that the dedication might refer to Edward VI.[28] Samuel Berger, on the other hand offers quite a different theory. He remarks that the guard-leaf on which the dedication now is, has lost its companion. This, he supposes, once bore the dedicatory distichs addressed to Charlemagne by one of his familiars who had this masterpiece of Chrysography executed. Later, when the manuscript was presented to the King of England, the donor cut off this folio and had the inscription copied again on the companion blank folio and accompanied with the royal English coat of arms. Mr. Hoskier for reasons which will become apparent in our description of his book rejects also this hypothesis, denying in addition, that any folio was cut off, (p. 1.) So all we can say is that some time during the sixteenth century our manuscript was in the possession of one of the Kings of England or of some member of the royal family, granted that the coat of arms could have belonged to some other person than the King himself. Later it came into the possession of the Marquis of Douglas and Clydesdale[29] and passed afterwards into the Library of the Duke of Hamilton, where it was known as Codex Hamilton 251. In 1882 the whole Hamilton collection was bought by the royal Chalcography of Berlin with the understanding that the British Museum should have the privilege of purchasing back a certain number of

[28] P. 1; cf. Berger, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

[29] Wattenbach, *op. cit.*, p. 152. According to S. Berger, *Hist. de la Vulgate*, p. 397, the fly-leaf bears the following note: Douglas et Lyderdale, 1300, Londini, 1747.

valuable manuscripts of special interest to England. Among these were our Gospels. But the direction of the British Museum having failed to raise the money necessary for the purchase in proper time, the royal Chalcography of Berlin directed Mr. Truebner, the book-dealer of Strassburg, to resell those manuscripts at auction. The sale took place at Sotheby's, London, in 1889, when the Hamilton purple Gospels fell to Mr. Quaritch, the well-known English antiquarian, who sold them the following year to Mr. Thomas Irwin of Oswego (N. Y.). They now belong to Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan the American Maecenas. To him from its folds of purple the golden voice of this truly royal manuscript justly repeats the first distich of the dedicatory inscription:

FATO SERVATUS TIBI SUM, TER MAXIME PRINCEPS
TE QUOQUE SERVARUNT AUREA FATA MICHI.

The literature on our manuscript is scanty. In 1887, W. Wattenbach published a first notice in the eighth volume of the *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere Deutsche Geschichtskunde,* pp. 343-346, and a second one: *Ueber die mit Gold auf Purpur geschriebene Evangelienhandschrift der Hamilton'schen Bibliothek* (in Sitzungsberichte d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, 1889, pp. 143-156). A description with a facsimile in gold and colors appeared in *Catalogue of manuscripts chiefly from the Hamilton collection,* 1889, No. 1, gotten up in view of the auction sale, we suppose, and another one in *B. Quaritch's rough list,* No. 99. Finally, Samuel Berger who examined the manuscript while it was in the hands of Mr. Quaritch, and obtained additional information on its text, through the Rev. B. W. Bacon, when it had become the property of Mr. Irwin, devoted to it several pages of his excellent book, *Histoire de la Vulgate dans les premiers siècle du Moyen Age,* Paris, 1893, pp. 37, 259-262, 277, 397 f. The descriptions of W. Wattenbach and S. Berger, though not as complete as one might wish, are well worth reading; from them chiefly

we have gleaned most of the information, just imparted to our readers, on the history of the Morgan Codex.

## II.

### Description of Mr. Hoskier's Publication.

The title [30] adopted by Mr. Hoskier does not convey quite an accurate idea of the various elements of the publication to which it is prefixed. In fact the book consists mainly of an *Introduction, Preliminary Remarks,* four full page *Facsimiles* and a collation of the text (not an edition) with full critical apparatus, written in Latin, under the title of *Lectiones Variae,* etc. Of special importance among the accessories (Preface, Indexes, Colophon of the printer, etc.) is the *Appendix,* a collation, in Latin equally, of a fragment of the Gospels also in Mr. Morgan's collection.

We shall now proceed to describe each of the five chief portions of the book.[31]

Introduction, (pp. xi-cxvi).—In the first fifteen pages the writer tries to establish that the Morgan Codex was written on the British soil, in the last decades of the seventh century, as against Samuel Berger,[32] who considers it a product of the Palatine school inaugurated by Charlemagne, or of the north of France. He disagrees also with Wattenbach, who while ascribing the manuscript to the same date as Hoskier (since he identifies, or at least grants the possibility of identifying it with the famous manuscript executed by order of Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, and presented by him to the monastery of Ripon) still doubts whether it was written in Rome or in

[30] See above.

[31] In this description square brackets indicate our insertions where we quote Mr. Hoskier, whether verbatim or not.

[32] *Histoire de la Vulgate,* etc., pp. 259 ff.

England.[33] To prove his position, Mr. Hoskier establishes a comparison of the Morgan Codex with a number of well-known Codices of undoubted British origin and generally ascribed to the same age as he claims for the former. After this Mr. Hoskier goes into a detailed study of the text of the old Latin manuscripts and of some of the most famous Greek Codices and investigates the relation of the Latin texts to the Coptic, all this with a view to show the ancestry and affinities of the Morgan text, which he, afterwards traces through the *Saxon Versions.* "When we find," says Mr. Hoskier in his preface, "that our manuscript is sometimes alone, or nearly alone with *a* [*Cod. Vercellensis*], or *b* [*Cod. Veronensis*] or *d* [Cod. *Bezae*], or with *ff*[2] [*Cod. Corbeiensis* 2], or *h* [*Cod. Claromontanus*], or *k* [*Cod. Bobbiensis*],—or *r* [*Cod. Usserianus* 2], or *g*1 [*Sangermanensis*],—as to forms; and when we find ourselves alone with ℵ [*Sinaiticus*] or *A* [*Cod. Alexandrinus*], or *D* [*Cod. Bezae*], or 59, 73 (Syr. S. Goth.) or CΣ [*Cod. Ephraemi* and *Cod. Rossanensis*] of the Greeks, or with *a d* δ together in Greek order; or alone with Irenaeus' translator, or Lucifer, or with Coptic, we realize that we are face to face with a problem of deepest interest. For this does not mean that the text is a mixed text, but that the *Ur-text* or *base* goes very, very far back and contains some of the elements of the other texts, which have come down to us by branches, yet originally was another recension, lost to us otherwise, which we recognize by a few unique readings which have weathered the storm of revision and transmission and still linger amid the older surroundings." A few lines further, the author states his method as follows:—"From Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, the Curetonian, Syriac and the Coptic versions, we carry the history of our text through the *Codex Vercellensis* (*a*) to St. Patrick, then, with the *Codex Bezae* (*d*) and Columbanus' less pure *r* on Irish soil through the VI and VII centuries with the

[33] *Ueber die mit Gold auf Purpur* etc., *Sitzungsb. d. Preuss. Akad. z. Berlin,* 1889, p. 153.

*Book of Durrow,* to the time when the Manuscript itself was written; and thence running concurrently with the other English Texts A (*Amiatinus*) and Y (*Lindisfarne*) with L (*Chad*) through D [*Liber Armachanus*] Q [*Book of Kells*] R [*Cod. Rushworth*] to E [*Cod. Marmoutier*—British Museum Egerton 609], and beyond."

Preliminary Remarks (pp. 1-71).—In the preliminary remarks Mr. Hoskier treats of the external appearance of the Codex (size and color of parchment, arrangement of folios into quires, signatures, disposition of text on the page, etc.) and especially, of the script (shape of letters, ligatures, abbreviations) and of various peculiarities or defects of spelling and accentuation. He insists more than on any thing, on the script and spelling in this manuscript. While Wattenbach distinguishes but two hands, Mr. Hoskier sees forty-five different ones.[34] Some extend over one or more quires, most of them over but a few folios ,or even a dozen lines or so. This number seems formidable. It is " unheard of so far in a manuscript," says Mr. Hoskier, " but, if we have erred we cannot possibly have erred fifty per cent, and therefore over twenty different hands would remain " (p. 3). Occasionally also he calls attention to some special or rather characteristic readings of the several scribes. Mr. Hoskier finds it difficult to account for so many hands writing such a very varying amount of copy. At first he supposed that the execution of the manuscript was on the nature of a rush order. Why so, he explains on page 3. This manuscript he *hesitatingly* suggests was perhaps written by order of St. Wilfrid like the one which he presented to the Church of Ripon (see above, page 592). " It might be that he wished to offer something to the Roman authority before

[34] He describes every one of them in the greatest detail, with an amazing perspicacity. Here he sees that the scribe is a man of versatile character, or over-confident, there, that he was tiring, or sick, in another case although the writing of a scribe is large " and writing becomes smaller as we advance in age " Mr. Hoskier judges that he was an old man, for his style favors the ancient division of lines.

whom he was twice cited to appear (and twice acquitted of the charges preferred against him) and that he deliberately had the members of his monastery at Ripon (or elsewhere) enter the Scriptorium and assist in executing the present he designed, also deliberately copying Italian rather than English or Irish forms, though enough of them linger to show the local origin of the MS. . . . Haste in execution might also be accounted for by his order to appear at Rome within a certain time. Or again, upon his return, he might have wished to show his gratitude to Pope Agatho, or the later Pope John. At any rate a voyage of such a MS. *to* Italy might well account for the inscription later on its return as a present in the XVI century." This way, however, of accounting for a rush order was abandoned by Mr. Hoskier. "The above," he says in a foot note to the preceding words, "written long since we allow to stand; but it is our conviction that the MS. never left England at all, as the continuity of its text runs straight on through R to W in the XIII century[35] as shown elsewhere." Still on page 57 Mr. Hoskier seems to cling to the theory of the rush-order—though for what other reason he does not state—and he tries to explain how time could be gained by multiplying the copyists "it being evident that each scribe must have completed his task before the other could begin at the proper place where the former left off, and there is only one place in the whole book where the scribes do not meet exactly and only two letters are missing there." We confess that we fail to grasp the solution he offers. But this does not matter, as probably Mr. Hoskier having abandoned the only reason he mentions anywhere for a rush order abandoned also this explanation.[36] And this is very likely why on this very page 57 he

[35] R = Rushworth Gospels, IXth century, Oxford, Bodl. Auct. D. 2, 19, also called Gospels of Mac Regol. W = Brit. Mus. Reg. 1 B. XII.

[36] We give it here however, for the benefit of our readers and in justice to Mr. Hoskier . . . "if we suppose that the exemplar serving as a model was recopied line for line, we establish two things, 1st, the probability of the "rush-order" and the possibility of its being carried out

proposes another theory to explain the large number of hands, viz., that all the brothers of the monastery were given an opportunity of writing a part—large or small according to their ability and handwriting—for an important *patron,* or purpose or occasion." A question of sentiment, therefore, not one of expedition.

Fac-Similes.—These are evidently intended for the *Preliminary Remarks* which we have seen are chiefly concerned with the Paleography of the manuscript. However, they have been distributed throughout the book as follows: The first, before the general title, in colors, showing golden letters on purple vellum: (S. Matthew, x, 29-xi, 1); the second, also in colors, showing golden letters on bluish vellum: (S. John, xviii, 6-19); the third, between the Introduction and the sub-title of the Preliminary Remarks, plain phototype, letters in white on gray ground: (Luke, xviii, 43-xix, 14). The fourth one, immediately after sub-title of Lectiones Variae, letters and ground as above: (S. Matthew, vi, 13-24).

Lectiones Variae (pp. 175-344).—The collation of the text is based on the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, Rome, 1592. Mr. Hoskier first undertook it at the request of Abbot Gasquet for the use of the Benedictine revisers of the Vulgate. But he soon detected that the text of the Morgan manuscript was of considerable importance for the history of the Old Latin version and incidentally for that of the original Greek, and for the textual history of the Syriac, Northern Coptic and Gothic versions, and could not refrain from extending his collations to all of these, for the Synoptic Gospels. For the Gospel of St. John he went even further, drawing in the Southern Coptic, the Armenian, the Arabic, the Ethiopic and even the Old and later Saxon. The readings, where not appearing for the first time, are generally taken from the latest and most reliable editions and authorities, and to these Mr.

by a large number of scribes; and 2nd, that an exemplar (since perished) of a much earlier date existed with this very text.—Thus we add an indeterminate number of years to our manuscript's age."

Hoskier, in some instances refers us for fuller statement, the evidence in the collation being, as he says, "perforce condensed to the limit." In the case of Wordsworth, when our author differs from him, "the evidence has been checked and should be correct." Nor has Mr. Hoskier neglected the Fathers, such as S. Justin, S. Cyprian, S. Jerome, S. Patrick. This great accumulation of readings, he warns us "is not a rehash but a careful attempt to show action and reaction of the versions one upon the other and to help to untangle the intricacies of the transmission, as such it is hoped that it will be found useful and not too elaborate. Care has been taken, when possible, to bring into juxtaposition readings which may have a bearing upon each other.—The late Saxon has been occasionally introduced to show our [manuscript's] influence and that of others upon it." (p. cxvi). An *Elenchus* of the codices used in this collation is prefixed to it. It shows in every case the edition or authority followed by Mr. Hoskier, together with the presumed age of the Codex. We find there all the best known manuscripts of the Vulgate (32 MSS.) and Itala (28 MSS.) which Mr. Hoskier cites throughout his collation, and a good many others which are cited occasionally only, as a rule from some good authority, as the Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum,[37] (16 MSS.), the "*Ada Handschrift* of Corssen *et al.* Leipzig, 1889" [38] (40 MSS. mostly from *Bibliothèque Nationale* of Paris and other French Libraries) and from the "*Schepps edition,* Würzburg, 1887" [39] (13 MSS.). Then come the editions of the Vulgate: Stephanus (1546) Henten (1583) the Sixtina (1590) and the Clementina (1592),—the Oriental Versions: Syriac, from the editions of Gwilliam (Peshitto), Burkitt (Curetonian and Sinaitica) and Gibson-Lewis (Hieronymian); Arabic Diatessaron mostly from

[37] With autotype Facsimiles, Part I, Greek, 1881, Part II, Latin, 1887.

[38] *Die Trierer Ada-Handschrift bearbeitet und herausgegeben*, Leipzig, 1889, (with 38 plates) by several authors; the dissertation by Corssen.

[39] Presumably *Die ältesten Evangelien handschriften der Würtzburger Universitätsbibliothek*, Würzburg, 1887.

the edition of Hogg, Coptic (Bohairic) from the edition of Horner; the others from Tischendorf and others.—Finally the Fathers from Galland and other ancient and modern editions. In this formidable array of Codices and authorities we miss entirely the Greek Codices, a good many of which, the Sinaiticus especially, appear quite often in Mr. Hoskier's Critical Apparatus.

Appendix (pp. 345-357).—The subject of the Appendix is a fragment of 18 folios of the VII or VIII century. It shows portions of St. John and St. Luke, bound, as it seems, without regard to the order of books and chapters. This fragment comes from the Libri Collection, and originally belonged to the same ms. as a Nuremberg fragment published by Dombart in *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie* (Leipzig, 1881, pp. 465-478). The collation was undertaken by Mr. Hoskier at the request of Abbot Gasquet and the sign $\overset{\circ}{M}$ has been adopted to designate this fragment.

H. Hyvernat.

Hyvernat, Henry,
1858-1941.
An account of a
recent publication on
the Golden Purple Codex
of the Pierpont Morgan
collection. --